

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-8 and 10-13 are pending in the present application. In this amendment, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 8 and canceled claims 9 and 14-23 from further consideration in this application. Applicants are not conceding that the subject matter encompassed by claims 1, 8-9, and 14-23, prior to this Amendment, is not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner. Claims 1 and 8 were amended and claims 9 and 14-23 were canceled in this Amendment solely to facilitate expeditious prosecution of the application. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue claims, including the subject matter encompassed by claims 1, 8-9, and 14-23, as presented prior to this Amendment and additional claims in one or more continuing applications. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

I. Examiner Interview

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the interview that was conducted on March 6, 2008. Claim 1 and the cited reference were discussed. No agreement was reached.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 102, Anticipation

The examiner has rejected claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by InfiniBand™ Architecture (Release 1.1, 11/6/2002) (hereinafter “*InfiniBand*”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants have canceled claims 9 and 14-23. Claims 1 and 8 are the remaining independent claims.

Regarding claim 1, the Examiner asserts that *InfiniBand* teaches “wherein the join request is a send-without-receive request” on pages 101-103, 630, and 781. Specifically, the Examiner states that *InfiniBand* teaches nodes joining and leaving multicast groups through a management action.

Applicants agree that *InfiniBand* teaches nodes joining and leaving multicast groups. What *InfiniBand* fails to teach, however, is a join request that is a send-without-receive request that specifies that the second InfiniBand end node is to be a send-without-receive member of the multicast group that can send packets but will not receive packets, and wherein switches in the InfiniBand system area network will route packets from the second InfiniBand end node but will not route any packets to the second InfiniBand end node.

InfiniBand, pages 101-103, 630, and 781, teaches a node joining a group through a management action where the node supplies the LID for the ports that will participate. No mention is made in the cited

sections of *InfiniBand* of receiving a join request from an end node that specifies that the end node is to be a send-without-receive member of the multicast group.

Applicants also claim switches in the InfiniBand system area network routing packets from the second InfiniBand end node but not routing any packets to the second InfiniBand end node. When the multicast group is created, the second InfiniBand end node is the only member of the multicast group and the group includes no members that will receive packets.

As discussed above, the sections of *InfiniBand* cited by the Examiner describe nodes joining and leaving groups. Applicants do not claim a node joining a group. Applicants claim a join request from a particular type of end node, i.e. one that can send packets but will not receive packets.

Applicants also claim wherein when the multicast group is created, the second InfiniBand end node is the only member of the multicast group and the multicast group includes no members that will receive packets. *InfiniBand* does not teach this feature. *InfiniBand* teaches creating groups, but does not teach creating a group where a send-without-receive node is the only member of the group.

Claim 8 now recites: and further wherein the first member is a send-without-receive member that can send packets but will not receive packets, and still further wherein switches in the InfiniBand system area network will route packets from the first member but will not route any packets to the first member. The Examiner asserts that *InfiniBand* teaches a send-without-receive member at page 102. Applicants respectfully disagree. *InfiniBand*, page 102, teaches a node using a multicast LID and GID in all packets sent to the multicast group. *InfiniBand* does not teach the node not receiving packets.

Claim 8 also describes the Subnet Administration routing the first switch to discard all packets from the first member if the first member is the only remaining member in the multicast group. This first member is a send-without-receive member that will not receive packets. *InfiniBand* does not teach these features.

III. Conclusion

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is patentable over *InfiniBand* and is now in condition for allowance.

The examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: March 13, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

/Lisa L.B. Yociss/_____

Lisa L.B. Yociss
Reg. No. 36,975
Yee & Associates, P.C.
P.O. Box 802333
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 385-8777
Attorney for Applicants